

REMARKS

Claims 1–28 were previously pending in this application. In this response, claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter and not for any reason of patentability. No claims are canceled. Claims 1–28 remain pending.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,909,700 to Benmohamed et al. (hereinafter “Benmohamed”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Benmohamed relates to configuring an IP network. Specifically, Benmohamed discusses techniques for "optimizing network topology; and determining router placement within a network" (Abstract). Step 208 in Figure 2 "perturb[s] network topology". An IP network consists of a set of point-to-point links between routing devices. The links can change, thus reconfiguring the network topology.

See also claim 1 of Benmohamed: "method for designing a packet-based communications network". Furthermore, the network of Benmohamed is a type of network formed by "several types of network routers... for instance a packet switch (col. 1, lines 35–40).

Claim 1 recites two distinct networks; a data network and a logical network that overlays the data network. The technique of claim 1 relates to "reorganizing [the] overlay network".

Type of Response: Non-Final Office Action of 03/23/2007

Application Number: 10/698,846

Attorney Docket Number: 304871.02

Filing Date: 10/30/2003

This distinction has been clarified in claim 1, which, regarding the overlay network, now recites "the overlay network comprising nodes with application-level interconnections that form the overlay network, where the nodes exchange application-level communications via the interconnections, and where the application-level communications are transmitted via a data network that the logical network overlays". In other words, the overlay network overlays the underlying data network (e.g., an IP network). The data network is equivalent to the type of network described in Benmohamed. Benmohamed has no overlay network, at the application level, overlaying its data network. Claim 1 does not recite features for reconfiguring or relinking a data routing network such as Benmohamed's IP network. For reorganizing or relinking, claim 1 recites features above the network level.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to indicate what in Benmohamed corresponds to an overlay or logical network (for application-level communication), and what in Benmohamed corresponds to a data network.

Claim 10 recites that "the overlay network comprises a peer-to-peer network of nodes with respective IP addresses, where some nodes have links to other nodes, the links comprising the IP addresses of the corresponding nodes, where the nodes exchange application-level communications via the peer-to-peer network, and where the application-level communications are transmitted via an IP network". As discussed above. Benmohamed discusses only reconfiguration of a data network by reconfiguring links between IP routers. Benmohamed does not teach or suggest any peer-to-peer network where peers communicate using IP addresses at the application level.

Type of Response: Non-Final Office Action of 03/23/2007

Application Number: 10/698,846

Attorney Docket Number: 304871.02

Filing Date: 10/30/2003

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 recites a first and second node "communicating through a data network". Logical network links between nodes comprise "information that enables nodes to address network communications to other nodes". Claim 19 recites both a data network and a logical network (a network overlaying the data network).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The claims are patentably distinct over the cited art. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Non-Final Office Action of 03/23/2007

Application Number: 10/698,846

Attorney Docket Number: 304871.02

Filing Date: 10/30/2003

If this Response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: August 23, 2007

By: /James T. Strom/

James T. Strom, Reg. No.: 48,702
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (425) 706-0362
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

August 23, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Type or Print Name

Type of Response: Non-Final Office Action of 03/23/2007
Application Number: 10/698,846
Attorney Docket Number: 304871.02
Filing Date: 10/30/2003